Almost disjunct matrices from codes and designs

Alexander Barg and Arya Mazumdar*

arXiv:1510.02873v1 [cs.IT] 10 Oct 2015

Abstract

In group testing, simple binary-output tests are designed to identify a small number t of defective items that are present in a large population of N items. Each test takes as input a group of items and produces a binary output indicating whether the group is free of the defective items or contains one or more of them.

In this paper we study a relaxation of the combinatorial group testing problem. A matrix is called (t, ϵ)-disjunct if it gives rise to a nonadaptive group testing scheme with the property of identifying a uniformly random t-set of defective subjects out of a population of size N with false positive probability of an item at most ϵ. We establish a new connection between (t, ϵ)-disjunct matrices and error correcting codes based on the dual distance of the codes and derive estimates of the parameters of codes that give rise to such schemes. Our methods rely on the moments of the distance distribution of codes and inequalities for moments of sums of independent random variables. We also outline a new connection between group testing schemes and combinatorial designs.

Keywords: *Group testing, disjunct matrices, error-correcting codes, constant weight codes, dual distance, combinatorial designs.*

I. Introduction

Suppose that the elements of a finite population of size N contain a small number of defective elements. The elements are tested in groups, and the collection of tests is said to form a group testing scheme if the outcomes of the tests enable one to identify any defective configuration size at most t. Suppose that the number of tests in a group testing scheme is M, then constructing a non-adaptive group testing scheme is equivalent to constructing a binary *test matrix* of dimensions $M \times N$ where the (i, j)-th entry is 1 if the ith test includes the jth element and is 0 otherwise. Each row of the matrix corresponds to a test, and the result of this test is positive if the indices of ones in the row have a nonempty intersection with the indices of the defective configuration. The smallest possible number of tests in terms of the total number of subjects N and the maximum number of defective elements t is known to satisfy

$$M = \Theta\Big(\frac{t^2}{\log t} \log N\Big) \tag{1}$$

[9], [14], [35]. Recently, it has been shown that there exist schemes that match this bound (i.e., up to a multiplicative constant) [12]. This result was obtained by studying the ensemble of random binary constant weight codes, i.e., sets of binary vectors with a fixed number of ones.

AMS Subject Classification: Primary 68Q25, secondary 94C30.

∗ Corresponding author.

A. Barg is with the Department of ECE and ISR, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742 and Institute for Problems for Information Transmission, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia. Email: abarg@umd.edu. Research supported by NSF grants CCF1217894, CCF1217245, and CCF1422955.

A. Mazumdar is with the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455. Email: arya@umn.edu. Phone: 612-625-3505. Research supported in part by NSF grants CCF1318093 and CCF1453121.

A construction of group testing schemes from error-correcting code matrices and using code concatenation [24] appeared in the foundational paper by Kautz and Singleton [20]. In [20], the authors introduced a two-level construction in which a q-ary ($q > 2$) Reed-Solomon code is concatenated with a unit-weight binary code. The resulting vectors are used as columns of the testing matrix. Since every symbol of the Reed-Solomon codeword is replaced by a binary vector of Hamming weight one, the overall code is formed of codewords of a fixed Hamming weight. Many later constructions of group testing schemes also rely on Reed-Solomon codes and code concatenations; among them [11], [37]. Other explicit constructions of non-adaptive group testing schemes with $M = O(t^2 \log N)$ were suggested in [18], [29], [32]; see also [7], [8].

It has been suggested to construct schemes that permit a small probability of error (i.e., allowing false positives). Such schemes were considered under the name of *weakly separated designs* in [25], [26], [40] and independently in [23]. With this relaxation it is possible to reduce the number of tests to be proportional to $t \log N$ [40]; however, this result is not constructive. A recent work [15] suggests a way to construct weakly separated designs with $O(t \operatorname{poly}(\log N))$ tests by partitioning the subjects into blocks of equal size and using optimal non-adaptive tests independently for each block. An explicit (non-probabilistic) construction of almost disjunct matrices with the number of tests proportional to $t^{3/2}\sqrt{\log N}$ was presented in [28] and was subsequently improved to $t \log^2 N / \log t$ in [27]. Another construction of almost disjunct matrices using Reed-Solomon codes was suggested in [2], where it was shown that there exist group testing schemes with $M = O(t \log N)$ for $t \leq \log N$. Related notions are also explored in [3], [13], [15] with explicit constructions, and a generalization of weakly separated codes to almost cover-free codes was considered in [10].

The construction of [20] and many others above are based on constant weight error-correcting codes. Estimates of the parameters of the group testing schemes from constant weight codes were obtained using the minimum distance of the code [20] and more recently using the average distance of the code [27], [28].

The current work takes a different approach, relating construction of almost disjunct matrices and the *dual distance* of codes. Our main contribution consists of a refined analysis of constructions of group testing schemes that relates the number of tests M to the dual distance of the (constant weight) code and moments of the distance distribution. Starting with the moments and using classical inequalities for sums of independent random variables, we obtain general conditions for the existence of almost disjunct matrices. Using one of our constructions, it is possible to obtain testing schemes with $O(t \log^2 N)$ tests; see Corollary 11 below and the subsequent discussion.

Apart from [27], [28], the connection between error-correcting codes and weakly separated designs was known only for the very specific family of *maximum distance separable* codes [2], [23], for which much more than the dual distance is known.

We note that constant weight codes with a given value of the dual distance d' are known as combinatorial designs (of strength $d' - 1$). An r-design (in more detail, an r-(n, w, λ) design) is a collection of w-subsets of an n-set V, called blocks, such that every r elements of V are contained in the same number λ of blocks. The use of r-designs for constructing disjunct matrices is not new, see, e.g., Sect. 7.4 of [7]. Special cases of designs have been used to construct nonadaptive group testing matrices for some particular parameters [38, Sec. 11.3], [4, Ch.56]. However the conclusion in [7, p. 146], is that disjunct matrices obtained from designs are of little interest because of restrictions on their parameters. Our approach is rather different from the one taken in the cited references, resulting in meaningful constructions of almost disjunct matrices and group testing schemes.

II. Definitions and Notation

Define the *support* of a vector $\mathrm{supp}(x), x \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$ as the set of coordinates where x has nonzero entries. The support of a set of vectors $X = \{x_i, i \geq 1\}$ is the union of supports $\cup_{i \geq 1} \mathrm{supp}(x_i)$.

Definition 1: An $M \times N$ binary matrix A is called t-disjunct if the support of any of its columns is not contained in the union of the supports of any other t columns.

It is easy to see that a t-disjunct matrix gives a group testing scheme that identifies any defective set up to size t. Conversely, any group testing scheme that identifies any defective set up to size t must be a $(t-1)$-disjunct matrix [7]. To a great advantage, disjunct matrices support a simple identification algorithm that runs in time $O(Nt)$. Indeed, any element that participates in a test with a negative outcome is not defective. After we perform all the tests and weed out all the non-defective elements, the disjunctness property of the matrix guarantees that all the remaining elements are defective.

A few words on notation. Let $[N] := \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ and let $\mathcal{P}_t(N)$ denote the set of t-subsets of $[N]$. The usual notation for probability $\Pr$ is used to refer a probability measure which will be understood from the context. Separate notation will be used for some frequently encountered probability spaces. In particular, we use P_{R_t} to denote the uniform probability distribution on $\mathcal{P}_t(N)$. If we need to choose a random t-subset I and a random index in $[N] \backslash I$, we use the notation $P_{R'_t}$.

Definition 2: For any $\epsilon > 0$, an $M \times N$ matrix A with columns $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_N$, is called (t, ϵ)-disjunct if

$$P_{R'_t}(\{I \in \mathcal{P}_t(N),\, j \in [N] \setminus I : \mathrm{supp}(a_j) \subseteq \cup_{k \in I} \mathrm{supp}(a_k)\}) \leq \epsilon.$$

The group testing scheme given by a (t, ϵ)-disjunct matrix is called a (t, ϵ) scheme.
In other words, the union of supports of a randomly and uniformly chosen subset of t columns of a (t, ϵ)-disjunct matrix does not contain the support of any other random column with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$.

The next fact follows from the definition of disjunct matrix and the decoding procedure [7, p. 134].

Proposition 1: A (t, ϵ)-disjunct matrix defines a group testing scheme that can identify all items in a random defective configuration of size t, and with probability ϵ identifies any randomly chosen item outside of the defective configuration as defective (false-positive).

Remark 1: Unless $\epsilon < t/N$, the average number of false positives in the (t, ϵ) scheme will be greater than the actual number of defectives. However even in that case, the tests will output a subset of $[N]$ of a vanishingly small proportion that includes all of the t defective items.

A code of length M is a subset of the vector space $\mathbb{F}_q^M$. The minimum Hamming distance between distinct codewords of $\mathcal{C}$ is called the distance of the code. We use the notation $\mathcal{C}(M, N, d)$ to refer to the code of length M, cardinality N and distance d. If in addition all the codevectors of the code $\mathcal{C}$ contain exactly w nonzero entries, we call it a constant weight code and use the notation $\mathcal{C}(M, N, d, w)$.

III. Almost disjunct matrices from codes

A. The Kautz-Singleton construction

The main observation behind this construction is the following result of [20].

Proposition 2: An (M, N, d, w) constant weight binary code $\mathcal{C}$ provides a t-disjunct matrix, where $t = \left\lfloor \frac{w-1}{w-d/2} \right\rfloor$.

Proof: Write the codewords of $\mathcal{C}$ as the columns of an $M \times N$ matrix. The intersection of supports of any two columns has size at most $w - d/2$. Hence if $w > t(w - d/2)$, the support of any column will not be contained in the union of supports of any t other columns. ■

This proposition implies that a group testing scheme can be obtained from constant weight codes with large distance. In [20], it is observed that such codes can be obtained from non-constant-weight q-ary codes in which every symbol is replaced by its binary indicator vector in the alphabet.

The main contribution of this paper is a refined analysis of the *distance distribution* of codes that gives rise to almost disjunct matrices (see Def. 2). The dual distance of the code defined in sections III-B and III-C plays an important role in the analysis.

Our goal is to design an $M \times N$ matrix A such that t randomly chosen columns do not contain the support of any other of its columns. As above, we form the matrix using the codewords of a constant weight code $\mathcal{C}(M, N, d, w)$ as the columns. Let the codewords of $\mathcal{C}$ be $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N$ and let $d_{ij} := d(x_i, x_j)$. Having in mind the design of almost disjunct matrices, we begin with the following extension of Prop. 2. Denote by P the probability of violating the conditions of Def. 2:

$$P := P_{R_t'}(\{I \in \mathcal{P}_t(N), j \in [N] \setminus I : \operatorname{supp}(x_j) \subseteq \cup_{k \in I} \operatorname{supp}(x_k)\}).$$

Proposition 3: The following estimate holds true:

$$P \le P_{R_t'}\Big(\Big\{I \in \mathcal{P}_t(N), j \in [N] \setminus I : w \le \sum_{k \in I}(w - d_{jk}/2)\Big\}\Big). \tag{2}$$

In the next sections we develop new ways of analyzing almost disjunct matrices from various families of codes, and also connect them with combinatorial designs. In particular, we examine two different ways of constructing almost disjunct matrices from codes using the above proposition.

We will need the following well-known result.

Theorem 4: [17, Thm. 4] Let C be a finite set of numbers. Let $X_i, i = 1, \dots, t$ be random samples without replacement from C and let $Y_i, i = 1, \dots, t$ be random samples with replacement from C. If the function $f(x)$ is continuous and convex, then

$$\mathbb{E} f\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{t} X_i\Big) \le \mathbb{E} f\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{t} Y_i\Big). \tag{3}$$

We also use the following inequalities for moments of sums of independent random variables. Let $\{X_i, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ be a sequence of independent random variables with zero means. Then the following *Marcinkiewicz–Zygmund inequality* holds true [33]:

$$\mathbb{E}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{t} X_i\Big|^{\ell} \le C_\ell t^{\ell/2-1} \sum_{i=1}^{t} \mathbb{E}|X_i|^{\ell}, \quad \ell \ge 2, \tag{4}$$

where C_ℓ depends only on ℓ. In particular, one can take $C_l \le (3\sqrt{2})^l l^{l/2}$. Assume in addition that $E|X_i|^{\ell} < \infty$ for all $\ell > 2$. Then the following *Rosenthal inequality* holds true [34]:

$$\max\Big\{\sum_{i=1}^{t} \mathbb{E}|X_i|^{\ell}, \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{t} \mathbb{E}|X_i|^2\Big)^{\ell/2}\Big\} \le \mathbb{E}\Big|\sum_{i=1}^{t} X_i\Big|^{\ell} \le K_\ell \max\Big\{\sum_{i=1}^{t} \mathbb{E}|X_i|^{\ell}, \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{t} \mathbb{E}|X_i|^2\Big)^{\ell/2}\Big\}, \tag{5}$$

where the factor K_ℓ does not depend on t. Moreover, one can take $K_\ell = (2\ell/\log \ell)^{\ell}$ [19].

Observe that inequalities (4), (5) belong to a large group of Khinchine-type inequalities and their extensions to martingales. It is possible to further optimize the constant in (5) as well as to establish

other versions of (4) and (5), see e.g., [19], [30]. The choice of the inequality depends on the relation between the parameters of the group testing scheme, and we do not attempt to optimize the constants for the large number of possible cases.

B. Almost disjunct matrices from nonbinary codes

In this section we estimate the probability P in (2) for nonbinary linear codes used in the Kautz-Singleton construction.

Before proceeding, let us recall some concepts related to the distance distribution of codes. More information about them can be found, for instance, in [5], [6] or [24]. Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be a code. The distance distribution of $\mathcal{C}$ is the set of numbers $(A_0, A_1, \ldots, A_n)$, where

$$A_i = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|}|\{(x,y) \in \mathcal{C}^2 : d(x,y) = i\}|, \quad i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$$

is the average number of ordered pairs of codevectors with Hamming distance i. Clearly, the distance of $\mathcal{C}$ equals the smallest $i \geq 1$ such that $A_i > 0$.

Define the *dual distance* d' of $\mathcal{C}$ as follows:

$$d'(\mathcal{C}) = \min\{j \geq 1 : A'_j := \sum_{i=0}^{n} A_i K_j(i) > 0\}, \tag{6}$$

where $K_j(i)$ is the value of the Krawtchouk polynomial of degree j [24, p.129]. If $\mathcal{C}$ is a linear code, then d' equals the distance of the dual code $\mathcal{C}^{\perp}$.

Consider a q-ary (n, N, d) $\mathcal{C}$. To construct a group testing (almost disjunct) matrix we map every symbol of the codeword to a binary vector of $(q-1)$ 0s and one 1 in the location that corresponds to the value of the symbol. Applying this mapping, we obtain a set of binary vectors of length M and constant weight $w = n = M/q$. The parameters of the resulting binary constant weight code $\mathcal{D}$ are $(M = qn, N, 2d, w = n = M/q)$.

The main result proved in this part is given by the following statement.

Theorem 5: Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a q-ary (n, N) code with dual distance d' and let $\mathcal{M}$ be an $M \times N$ matrix constructed from it using the Kautz-Singleton mapping. If $t \leq q$, then for any even $\ell < d'$ the probability in (2) is bounded above as follows:

$$P \leq B(\ell, t)\Big(\frac{e\ell(q-1)}{2n(q-t)^2}\Big)^{\ell/2} \sum_{i=0}^{\ell/2} \Big(\frac{(q-1)\ell}{2ne}\Big)^i, \tag{7}$$

where $B(\ell, t) = \min\big\{(18\ell t)^{\ell/2}, t^{\ell}\big\}$.

The examples given below show that it is possible to chose specific code families so that estimate (7) is nontrivial. To prove theorem we need several auxiliary statements.

Choose two codewords from the code $\mathcal{C}$ randomly and uniformly with replacement, and denote by Z the random variable whose value is the distance between these codewords. Clearly, the distribution of Z is given by

$$\Pr(Z = i) = \frac{A_i}{N}, \quad i = 0, \ldots, n.$$

Define $\theta := (q-1)/q$.

We have the following proposition.

Proposition 6: Let $t \le q$. Then

$$P \le B(\ell,t)\Big(\frac{q}{n(q-t)}\Big)^{\ell}\mathbb{E}[\theta n - Z]^{\ell}, \tag{8}$$

where $\ell \ge 2$ is an even integer.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the q-ary code defined before the theorem, and let $\mathcal{D}$ be the code obtained from $\mathcal{C}$ by applying the Kautz-Singleton mapping. Given two codewords $x_j, x_k \in \mathcal{C}$ let $\delta_{jk} = d(x_j, x_k)$ and let $d_{jk} = 2\delta_{jk}$ be the distance between their images in $\mathcal{D}$. We will estimate from above the right-hand side in (2). With the current notation, the condition in (2) becomes $\sum_{k\in I}\delta_{jk} \le n(t-1)$. Using the assumption $t \le q$ yields $1 - \frac{t}{q} \ge 0$, and we can relax the inequality in (2) to the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} P &\le P_{R_t'}\Big(\Big\{I \in \mathcal{P}_t(N), j \in [N]\setminus I : \sum_{k\in I}(\theta n - \delta_{jk}) \ge n\Big(1-\frac{t}{q}\Big)\Big\}\Big)\\ &\le P_{R_t'}\Big(\Big\{I \in \mathcal{P}_t(N), j \in [N]\setminus I : \Big(\sum_{k\in I}(\theta n - \delta_{jk})\Big)^{\ell} \ge n^{\ell}\Big(1-\frac{t}{q}\Big)^{\ell}\Big\}\Big)\\ &\le \Big(n - \frac{nt}{q}\Big)^{-\ell}\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{k\in I}(\theta n - \delta_{jk})\Big)^{\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the second line follows because ℓ is even and on the third line we use the Markov inequality. Observe that δ_{jk} are random variables that denote the distance between two codewords x_j and $x_k, 1 \le k \le t$ chosen randomly from without replacement. Let μ_{jk} denote the random variable corresponding to δ_{jk} when the codewords are chosen with replacement, and note that μ_{jk} and $\mu_{j',k'}$ are independent whenever $j \ne j'$ or $k \ne k'$. Using Theorem 4, we have

$$P \le \Big(n - \frac{nt}{q}\Big)^{-\ell}\mathbb{E}(\sum_{k\in I}(\theta n - \mu_{jk}))^{\ell}. \tag{9}$$

Let us estimate the numerator in (9) using the Minkowski inequality (the triangle inequality for the ℓ-norm), again keeping in mind that ℓ is even. We obtain

$$P \le \frac{\Big(\sum_{k\in I}\Big(\mathbb{E}(\theta n - \delta_{jk})^{\ell}\Big)^{1/\ell}\Big)^{\ell}}{n^{\ell}(1-\frac{t}{q})^{\ell}} = \frac{t^{\ell}\mathbb{E}[\theta n - Z]^{\ell}}{n^{\ell}(1-\frac{t}{q})^{\ell}},$$

Now let us estimate the right-hand side of (9) relying on the Marcinkiewicz–Zygmund inequality (4). We obtain

$$P \le \frac{(3\sqrt{2})^{\ell}\ell^{\ell/2}t^{\ell/2-1}\sum_{k\in I}\mathbb{E}(\theta n - \mu_{jk})^{\ell}}{n^{\ell}(1-\frac{t}{q})^{\ell}} = \frac{(18\ell t)^{\ell/2}\mathbb{E}[\theta n - Z]^{\ell}}{n^{\ell}(1-\frac{t}{q})^{\ell}}.$$

This completes the proof. ∎

Our next step will be to estimate the moments in (8).

Lemma 7: Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a code over $\mathbb{F}_q$ of length n and size N with dual distance d'. For any $\ell < d'$,

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=0}^{n}(j-\theta n)^{\ell}A_j = \sum_{j=0}^{n}(j-\theta n)^{\ell}\binom{n}{j}\theta^{j}(1-\theta)^{n-j}. \tag{10}$$

Proof: Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{F}_q^n$ be a q-ary code with distance distribution $A_0, A_1, \ldots, A_n$ and let $A'_i, i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ be the dual distance distribution defined in (6). The following *Pless power moment identities* hold true [31], [24, p.131]:

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n} j^r A_j = \sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1)^j A'_j \Big(\sum_{\nu=0}^{r} \nu! S(r,\nu) q^{k-\nu} (q-1)^{\nu-j} \binom{n-j}{n-\nu} \Big)$$

where $S(r,\nu)$ are the Stirling number of second kind.

Taking $r < d'$, we find that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n} j^r A_j = \sum_{\nu=0}^{r} \nu! S(r,\nu) q^{k-\nu} (q-1)^{\nu} \binom{n}{n-\nu}.$$

Substituting the definition of $S(r,\nu) = \frac{1}{\nu!} \sum_{i=0}^{\nu} (-1)^{\nu-i} \binom{\nu}{i} i^r$ we find that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n} j^r A_j = \sum_{j=0}^{n} j^r \binom{n}{j} \theta^j (1-\theta)^{n-j}.$$

The lemma follows immediately. ∎

Another proof would be to use the general result for symmetric association schemes (34) established below together with the properties of the Hamming association scheme. We believe that readers familiar with association schemes will have no difficulty filling in the details.

Let us bound above the right hand side of (10).

Lemma 8: Let $1/2 < p < 1$. Then,

$$\mu_n(2r) := \sum_{j=0}^{n} \Big(\frac{j-np}{\sqrt{p(1-p)}} \Big)^{2r} \binom{n}{j} p^j (1-p)^{n-j} < (ner)^r \sum_{i=0}^{r} \Big(\frac{pr}{(1-p)ne} \Big)^i.$$

Proof: Let us define i.i.d. random variables X_i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ in the following way:

$$X_i = \begin{cases} \sqrt{(1-p)/p} & \text{with probability } p \\ -\sqrt{p/(1-p)} & \text{with probability } 1-p. \end{cases}$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}X_i = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}X_i^2 = 1$. Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$. Clearly, with probability $\binom{n}{i} p^i (1-p)^{n-i}$,

$$X = i\sqrt{(1-p)/p} - (n-i)\sqrt{p/(1-p)} = \frac{i-np}{\sqrt{p(1-p)}}.$$

Hence,

$$\mu_n(2r) = \mathbb{E}X^{2r}.$$

Let us estimate the right-hand side. We have

$$\mathbb{E}X^{2r} = \sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_{2r}} \mathbb{E}X_{i_1} \ldots X_{i_{2r}}.$$

We use the fact that the variables X_i are independent. If at least one of the X_{i_j}s appears only once then the corresponding monomial is zero. So it may be assumed that each index appears at least twice in the expectations that contribute to the sum. In particular, there are at most r distinct X_{i_j}s that can

appear. Suppose that $r-t$ such terms appear. Then, using the fact that X_{i_j}s have unit variance and $|X_{i_j}| \le \sqrt{p/(1-p)}$, we have,

$$\mathbb{E}X^{2r} \le \sum_{t=0}^{r} N_t (\sqrt{p/(1-p)})^{2t} = \sum_{t=0}^{r} N_t \Big(\frac{p}{1-p}\Big)^t,$$

where N_t is the number of ways one can assign integers $i_1, \dots, i_{2r} \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that each i_j appears, at least twice and exactly $r-t$ integers appear.

A crude bound on N_t gives,

$$N_t \le \binom{n}{r-t} (r-t)^{2r} \le \Big(\frac{ne}{r-t}\Big)^{r-t} (r-t)^{2r}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}X^{2r} &\le \sum_{t=0}^{r} (ne)^{r-t} (r-t)^{r+t} \Big(\frac{p}{1-p}\Big)^t \\ &\le (ner)^r \sum_{t=0}^{r} \Big(\frac{pr}{ne(1-p)}\Big)^t.\end{aligned}$$

■

Remark 2: When $\frac{p}{1-p} \le \frac{n}{r}$, the expression for $\mathbb{E}X^{2r}$ in the above proof can be further simplified. Namely, $\frac{pr}{ne(1-p)} \le e^{-1}$, and we have,

$$\mathbb{E}X^{2r} \le \frac{1}{1-e^{-1}} (ner)^r.$$

Proof of Theorem 5: Using Lemma 7 and Lemma 8 with $p = \theta$, we immediately obtain, for any even $\ell < d'$,

$$\mathbb{E}[Z - \theta n]^\ell \le \Big(\frac{ne\ell\theta}{2q}\Big)^{\ell/2} \sum_{i=0}^{\ell/2} \Big(\frac{(q-1)\ell/2}{ne}\Big)^i.$$

Substituting this estimate in (8) and rearranging, we obtain the bound (7). ■

Let us examine a few specific choices of the outer q-ary codes. In each case our goal is to choose the parameters so that the quantity in (7) is small, and to examine the parameters of the resulting almost disjunct matrices and group testing schemes.

1) Reed-Solomon codes: In this case, $n = q-1$, $\ell \approx \log_q N$. If $t > 18 \log N$, then the minimum in $B(\ell, t)$ is attained for the first term, otherwise for the second one. For instance, consider the first option. From (7) we obtain

$$P < \Big(\frac{9e\ell^2 t}{(q-t)^2}\Big)^{\ell/2} \Big(\frac{\ell}{2e}\Big)^{\ell/2+1} \approx \frac{\ell}{2e} \Big(\frac{2.13\ell^{3/2}\sqrt{t}}{q-t}\Big)^\ell.$$

Thus the probability P is small if we take $q > 2.13\ell^{3/2}\sqrt{t} + t$. Note that for Reed-Solomon codes we have $M = q(q-1)$. Overall we obtain $M = O\big(\max\{t^2, t(\log_q N)^3\}\big)$. This result is not as good as the result of [2] for RS codes, but the calculation in that paper relies on the entire weight distribution of the code, while we obtain the above estimate as a consequence of a general theorem that applies to all linear q-ary codes (note also the condition $t = o(q)$ in [2] which is not required in our derivations).

2) Algebraic-geometric codes: Let us consider two examples that rely on codes on algebraic curves.

a) Hermitian codes: Let q_0 be a power of a prime and let $0 \le r \le q^3$. There exists a family of linear q-ary codes, $q = q_0^2$, of length $n = q_0^3$, cardinality $N = q_0^{2(r+1-q(q-1)/2)}$ with dual distance $d' \ge r + q_0 + 2 - q_0^2$. In particular, choosing $r = q_0^2$, we obtain $d' \ge q_0 + 2$ and $N \approx q_0^{2q_0^2}$. This suffices to ensure that the quantity in (7) is small, i.e., the matrix formed by using Hermitian codes in the Kautz-Singleton construction is almost disjunct. Assuming that $t < q^2$, we obtain $M = q^5$ for the number of tests.

b) Suzuki codes: Similar results are obtained if we take Suzuki codes, i.e., linear q-ary codes with $q = 2q_0^2, q_0 = 2^m$ of length $n = q^2$, cardinality $N = q^{r+1-q_0(q-1)}$ with dual distance $d' \ge r - 2(q_0(q-1)-1)$, where the parameter r satisfies $2q_0(q-1) - 2 < r < q^2$ [16]. Namely, taking $r = 2q_0 q$, we obtain $d' \ge 2q_0 + 2$, so we can take $\ell = (1/4)n^{1/4}$. Substituting this in (7), we see that P is small if $t\ell < n(q-t)$, which allows us to choose any $t < O(n^{1/2})$. With this choice of the parameters testing matrices obtained from Suzuki codes using the Kautz-Singelton construction are guaranteed to have the almost disjunct property. Finally, observe that $\log_q N \approx q_0 q = n^{3/4}$, so

$$M = nq = O(n^{1/4} q \log_q N) = O(t^{3/2} \log_q N).$$

C. Almost disjunct matrices from constant weight codes

In this part we study properties of matrices constructed from constant weight codes with a known value of the dual distance d'. As is well known [5], a set of binary vectors with dual distance $d' = r+1$ forms a combinatorial design with the parameters r, M, w, λ (defined in the Introduction to the paper).

We again rely on the distance distribution of constant weight codes. The definitions are similar to those for q-ary codes given above. Let J_M^w be the set of all binary vectors (of length M) with w ones and let $\mathcal{C} \subset J_M^w$ be a code. We use the notation $\mathcal{C}(M, N, d, w)$ to refer to a constant weight code of length M, cardinality N, distance d and weight w. Define the distance distribution of $\mathcal{C}$ as follows:

$$b_i = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|} |\{(x,y) \in \mathcal{C}^2 : w - |\operatorname{supp}(x) \cap \operatorname{supp}(y)| = i\}| \tag{11}$$

for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, w$. The *dual distance* d' of the constant weight code $\mathcal{C}$ is defined as

$$d'(\mathcal{C}) = \min\Big\{ j \ge 1 : b'_j := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|} \sum_{i=0}^{w} b_i Q_j(i) > 0 \Big\},$$

where $Q_j(i)$ is the value of the Hahn polynomial of degree j; see (27) and [24, p.545].

The scheme of the proof is similar to the previous section. Beginning with Prop. 3 we will estimate the probability of a false positive using moments of the distance distribution of constant weight codes. First let us show that if $r < d'$, then the rth central moment of distance distribution equals the rth moment of the distance distribution of the sphere of weight w.

Theorem 9: Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a constant weight code of weight w, length M, distance distribution $\{b_i, i = 0, \ldots, w\}$ and dual distance d'. Let X be a hypergeometric random variable with pmf and moments

$$f_X(i) = \frac{\binom{w}{i}\binom{M-w}{w-i}}{\binom{M}{w}}, \quad i = 0, 1, \ldots, w; \quad \mathbb{E}X = \frac{w^2}{M}, \ \operatorname{Var}(X) = \frac{w^2(M-w)^2}{M^2(M-1)}. \tag{12}$$

As long as $r < d'$,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{w} \Big(\frac{w(M-w)}{M} - i \Big)^r b_i = |\mathcal{C}| \ \mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}X)^r]. \tag{13}$$

Proof: See the appendix. ■

Remark 3: Note that $\vartheta := w(M-w)/M$ is the average pairwise distance in the set of all binary vectors of weight w, so equality (13) gives the moments of the distance distribution about the mean. In this sense it is analogous to the corresponding result for the Hamming space (10). Irrespective of the value of r, the left-hand side of (13) is always greater than or equal to the right-hand side (this can be seen from (34) and (35) in the Appendix). This result was first proved in [36] using analytic methods, and is known as the Sidelnikov inequality. A similar inequality for general symmetric association schemes is proved in [39, p.55] using a combinatorial approach which we adopt in our proof of Theorem 9.

Let $Z := (1/2)d(x,y)$, where d is the Hamming distance, be the random variable defined by two random vectors chosen from a constant weight code (with replacement). We have $\Pr(Z=i) = b_i/|\mathcal{C}|$. Moreover, if $d' \geq 3$ then Theorem 9 implies that the central moments of Z up to order $d'-1$ are the same that the central moments of X, so

$$\mathbb{E}Z = \vartheta, \quad \mathrm{Var}(Z) = \vartheta^2/(M-1). \tag{14}$$

The main result of this section is given in the next theorem.

Theorem 10: Let $\mathcal{C}$ be an (M,N,d,w) constant weight code with dual distance d' and let $w < M/2$. Let t be the maximum number of defective items and suppose that $t < M/w$. For any even $\ell < d'$ the probability of a false positive test result for the group testing scheme constructed from $\mathcal{C}$ is bounded above as

$$P \leq B(\ell,t)\Big(\frac{e\ell(M-w)}{2(M-tw)^2}\Big)^{\ell/2} \sum_{i=0}^{\ell/2} \Big(\frac{(M-w)\ell}{2ew^2}\Big)^i, \tag{15}$$

where $B(\ell,t) = \min\{(18\ell t)^{\ell/2}, t^\ell\}$. In addition, if $M \geq \max\{4w^2t/\ell^2, w + 2ew^2/\ell\}$ then

$$P \leq t\Big(\frac{2\ell^2(M-w)}{(\log \ell)w(M-tw)}\Big)^\ell. \tag{16}$$

In the case of $\ell = 2$ we have

$$P < \frac{t}{M-1}\frac{(M-w)^2}{(M-wt)^2}. \tag{17}$$

Remarks: We comment on the conditions for the bounds (15)-(16) to be nontrivial in Corollary 11 below. As for (17), it gives a good bound for large M and small or slowly growing w and t.

Proof: For all $k \in I$ and an random index $j \in [N] \setminus I$, let ξ_{jk} be the random value of $d_{jk}/2 = d(x_j, x_k)$ when the vectors $x_j, x_k, k \in I$ are chosen from $\mathcal{C}$ randomly and uniformly without replacement and let η_{jk} denote the same quantity when the vectors are chosen with replacement. The variables $\eta_{jk}, \eta_{jk'}$ are independent whenever $k \neq k'$, and each of them is stochastically equivalent to the random variable Z defined above. Proceeding similarly to the proof of Proposition 6, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
P &\leq P_{R_t'}\Big(\Big\{I \in \mathcal{P}_t(N), j \in [N]\setminus I : w \leq \sum_{k\in I}(w - \xi_{jk})\Big\}\Big) \\
&= P_{R_t'}\Big(\Big\{I \in \mathcal{P}_t(N), j \in [N]\setminus I : \sum_{k\in I}(\vartheta - \xi_{jk}) \geq w\Big(1 - \frac{tw}{M}\Big)\Big\}\Big) \\
&\leq \Big(w - \frac{tw^2}{M}\Big)^{-\ell}\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{k\in I}(\vartheta - \xi_{jk})\Big)^\ell
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \Big(w - \frac{tw^2}{M}\Big)^{-\ell} \mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{k\in I}(\vartheta - \eta_{jk})\Big)^{\ell}, \tag{18}$$

where in the last step we used (3) and where $\ell, 2 \leq \ell < d'$ is an even number.

Now let us the Minkowski inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P &\leq \Big(w - \frac{tw^2}{M}\Big)^{-\ell} \Big(\sum_{k\in I}(\mathbb{E}(\vartheta - \eta_{jk})^{\ell})^{1/\ell}\Big)^{\ell} \\ &= \Big(w - \frac{tw^2}{M}\Big)^{-\ell} t^{\ell}\mathbb{E}(\vartheta - Z)^{\ell} \\ &\overset{(13)}{=} \Big(w - \frac{tw^2}{M}\Big)^{-\ell} t^{\ell}\mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}X)^{\ell}], \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where X is the hypergeometric random variable defined by (12).

As before, we can also estimate the right-hand side of (18) relying on the Marzinkiewicz-Zygmund inequality (4). We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P &\leq \Big(w - \frac{tw^2}{M}\Big)^{-\ell} \mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{k\in I}(\vartheta - \eta_{jk})\Big)^{\ell} \\ &\leq \Big(w - \frac{tw^2}{M}\Big)^{-\ell} (3\sqrt{2})^{\ell}\ell^{\ell/2}t^{\ell/2-1}\sum_{k\in I}\mathbb{E}(\vartheta - \eta_{jk})^{\ell} \\ &\leq \Big(w - \frac{tw^2}{M}\Big)^{-\ell} (18\ell t)^{\ell/2}\mathbb{E}(\vartheta - X)^{\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking this estimate together with (19) we obtain the bound

$$P \leq \min\{(18\ell t)^{\ell/2}, t^{\ell}\}\frac{\mathbb{E}(\vartheta - X)^{\ell}}{w^{\ell}(1 - \frac{tw}{M})^{\ell}}. \tag{20}$$

It is evident that $X = \sum_{i=1}^{w} X_i$, where $X_1, \ldots, X_w$ denote values of random samples drawn without replacement from a population of M values with w ones and $M - w$ zeros. Now using Theorem 4 we claim that

$$\mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}X)^{\ell}] \leq \mathbb{E}[(Y - \mathbb{E}Y)^{\ell}], \tag{21}$$

where $Y \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{w} Y_i$, and $Y_1, \ldots, Y_w$ denote samples from the same population with replacement. This makes the Y_i's into independent Bernoulli($\frac{w}{M}$) random variables, and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(Y - \mathbb{E}Y)^{\ell}] &= \sum_{j=0}^{w}\Big(j - \frac{w^2}{M}\Big)^{\ell}\binom{w}{j}\Big(\frac{w}{M}\Big)^{j}\Big(1 - \frac{w}{M}\Big)^{w-j} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{w}\Big(w\Big(1 - \frac{w}{M}\Big) - j\Big)^{\ell}\binom{w}{j}\Big(\frac{w}{M}\Big)^{w-j}\Big(1 - \frac{w}{M}\Big)^{j} \\ &< \Big(\frac{w^2 e\ell}{2M}\Big(1 - \frac{w}{M}\Big)\Big)^{\ell/2}\sum_{i=0}^{\ell/2}\Big(\frac{(M-w)\ell}{2ew^2}\Big)^{i}, \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where in the last step we have used Lemma 8 with $p = 1 - w/M$. Using (22) in (20) and rearranging, we obtain for the probability of the false positive the estimate (15).

Before proving (16), consider the case $\ell = 2$. Here the calculation is simpler because we can directly substitute the value of the variance of Z. Indeed, by independence

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{k\in I}(\vartheta - \eta_{jk})\Big)^2 = \sum_{k\in I}\mathrm{Var}(\eta_{jk}) = \frac{t\vartheta^2}{M-1}. \tag{23}$$

Using this in (18) and simplifying, we obtain (17).

Now let us prove (16), estimating the moment of the sum of random variables using Rosenthal's inequality (5). We have

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{k\in I}(\vartheta - \eta_{jk})\Big)^\ell \le K_\ell \max\Big\{\sum_{k\in I}\mathbb{E}(\vartheta - \eta_{jk})^\ell, \Big(\sum_{k\in I}\mathbb{E}(\vartheta - \eta_{jk})^2\Big)^{\ell/2}\Big\} \tag{24}$$

To estimate the maximum, we will take an upper bound on the first term given by (22) and show that it is greater than the second term. Assume that $M \ge w + 2ew^2/\ell$, then the largest term under the sum in (22) is the last one, and we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[(Y - \mathbb{E}Y)^\ell] \le \frac{\ell}{2}\Big(\frac{\ell(M-w)}{2M}\Big)^\ell,$$

and therefore,

$$\sum_{k\in I}\mathbb{E}(\vartheta - \eta_{jk})^\ell \le \frac{t\ell}{2}\Big(\frac{\ell(M-w)}{2M}\Big)^\ell. \tag{25}$$

The value of the second term on the right-hand side of (24) is found directly from (23) and equals

$$\Big(\sum_{k\in I}\mathrm{Var}(\eta_{jk})\Big)^{\ell/2} = \Big(\frac{t\vartheta^2}{M-1}\Big)^{\ell/2}. \tag{26}$$

As is easily checked, the right-hand side of (25) is greater than (26) if $M \ge 4w^2t/\ell^2$. Therefore the right-hand side of (25) also provides an upper bound on the maximum in (5). Substituting it in (18), we obtain the claimed bound (16). ■

In the next corollary we state the conditions for the bounds of Theorem 10 to guarantee that we obtain almost disjunct matrices. We focus on the estimate (16), but a similar claim can be also made with respect to the bound (15).

Corollary 11: Suppose that $w > 2\ell^2/\log\ell$ and $M > \max\{4w^2t/\ell^2, w + 2ew^2/\ell, wt\log\ell\}$. Then the codewords of a binary constant weight code of length M, cardinality M, weight w and dual distance $d' > \ell$ form an (t,ϵ)-disjunct matrix with ϵ approaching zero exponentially with the increase of ℓ.

Proof: Under the stated assumptions the probability of a false positive can be bounded above by (16), and the term $(\cdot)^\ell$ in that expression approaches zero with increasing ℓ. ■

It is possible to consolidate the restrictions in M in this corollary by making further assumptions on the relation of t and w, but we prefer to leave this statement in the most general form that arises from our estimation method. This corollary also implies that the number of tests M that suffices to for the matrix to be almost disjunct behaves as $M = O(\max(t\ell^2/\log^2\ell, \ell^3/\log^2\ell, t\ell^2)) = O(\ell^2\max(\ell/\log^2\ell, t))$. Hence, a constant weight code with dual distance greater than ℓ provides a $(t, \exp(-\ell))$ disjunct matrix with $M = O(t\ell^2)$ tests[1]. It can be further related to the number of elements N by assuming a relation of the dual distance and N. Note in particular that, if we assume $\ell = \Omega(\log N)$, then the probability that

[1]Note that due to the lower bound in (5) the order relations obtained here cannot be improved within the frame of the method considered.

there exist any false positive can be made to go to 0 (using an union bound on the $N-t$ elements) with total number of tests being $M = O(t \log^2 N)$.

It remains to use results about the existence of ℓ-designs. Major progress in the existence problem has been achieved in recent years. For instance, due to the result of [22, Theorem 1.3] it is known that there exists ℓ-designs with

$$\log N \leq c\ell \log(M/\ell),$$

for some constant $c > 0$, which supports the assumption of $\ell = \Omega(\log N)$ made above.

Another breakthrough result is due to [21]. For a design with the parameters ℓ, M, w, λ to exist it is necessary that $\binom{w-i}{\ell-i}$ divides $\binom{M-i}{\ell-i}$ for all $i = 0, 1, \ldots, \ell$. It has been shown in [21] that these conditions are also sufficient, i.e., combinatorial designs exist whenever their parameters satisfy the natural divisibility constraints. This advance provides a large supply of objects for the construction of almost disjunct matrices following the analysis in this section.

IV. Outlook

We introduced a general method of constructing explicit almost disjunct matrices from nonbinary and constant weight codes. The advantage of the introduced approach is related to its universal nature. While there are limitations on the applicability of the bounds obtained, in many cases they guarantee existence of almost disjunct matrices. Moreover, under certain assumptions stated in the paper, the consructed matrices rely on a number of tests of the order $O(t \log^2 N)$, matching the best known results. Experimentation shows that some of the simple constructions from constant weight codes behave very well in identifying random defectives. We plan to correlate the experiments with the results obtained here, hoping to report on the outcomes in a subsequent publication.

Appendix: Proof of Theorem 9

We prove Theorem 9, assuming we are given a (n, N, d, w) constant weight code.

1. (Jonhson association scheme) We will use some simple properties of the Johnson association scheme [1], [5]. Recall that J_n^w denotes the set of all binary vectors of length n and Hamming weight $w \leq n/2$. Let $\mathcal{C} \subset J_n^w$ be a code whose distance distribution $(b_0 = 1, b_1, \ldots, b_w)$ is defined in (11) above. Define the Hahn polynomial of degree $k = 0, 1, \ldots, w$ by its values as follows:

$$Q_k(i) = \frac{\mu_k}{v_i} E_i(k), \tag{27}$$

where $E_i(x), i = 0, 1, \ldots, w$ is the Eberlein polynomial, and

$$v_i = \binom{w}{i}\binom{n-w}{i}, \quad \mu_i = \binom{n}{i} - \binom{n}{i-1}. \tag{28}$$

are the valencies and the multiplicities of the scheme J_n^w. The polynomials $(Q_k, k = 0, 1, \ldots, w)$ form an orthogonal system on the set $\{0, 1, \ldots, w\}$. The explicit expression for $Q_k(i)$ is well known [5, p.48], [1, pp. 217-220]. Below we need only the expression for the constant $Q_0 \equiv 1$ and the linear polynomial, given by

$$Q_1(i) = (n-1)\Big(1 - \frac{ni}{w(n-w)}\Big). \tag{29}$$

Define the *dual distance distribution* of $\mathcal{C}$ by

$$b'_j = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{C}|} \sum_{i=0}^{w} b_i Q_j(i), \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, w$$

and notice that $b'_0 = 1$. By *Delsarte's inequalities* [5, Thm. 3.3] the coefficients b'_j are nonnegative. The Hahn polynomials satisfy the relation

$$Q_i(l)Q_j(l) = \sum_{k=0}^{m} q_{ij}^k Q_k(l) \tag{30}$$

where the numbers q_{ij}^k are called the Krein parameters of the scheme. Importantly, we have $q_{ij}^k \geq 0$ [5, Lemma 2.4]. In fact, the matrices $(E_i(k))$ and $(Q_k(i))$, $i, k = 0, 1, \ldots, w$ form the first and the second eigenvalue matrices of the scheme J_n^w. This implies the following relations:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{w} E_k(j)Q_i(k) = \binom{n}{w}\delta_{ij} \tag{31}$$

$$E_k(0) = v_k \tag{32}$$

(for the proofs see Thm. 3.5 and Prop. 3.4 of [1]).

2. On account of (30) we can write for all $i = 1, \ldots, w$

$$Q_1(i)^2 = \sum_{k=0}^{2} q_{11}^k Q_k(i)$$

and generally

$$Q_1(i)^r = \sum_{k=0}^{r} \beta_k(r) Q_k(i), \quad (r \geq 2) \tag{33}$$

where $\beta_k(r) \geq 0$ are some nonnegative coefficients that can be easily computed by orthogonality. Now consider

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=0}^{w} Q_1(i)^r b_i &= \sum_{i=0}^{w}\sum_{k=0}^{r} \beta_k(r) Q_k(i) b_i \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{r} \beta_k(r) \sum_{i=0}^{w} Q_k(i) b_i \\
&= |\mathcal{C}| \sum_{k=0}^{r} \beta_k(r) b'_k \\
&= |\mathcal{C}| \Big(\beta_0(r) + \sum_{k=d'}^{r} \beta_k(r) b'_k \Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Let us compute $\beta_0(r)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=0}^{w} v_i Q_1(i)^r &\overset{(33)}{=} \sum_{k=0}^{r} \beta_k(r) \sum_{i=0}^{w} v_i Q_k(i) \\
&\overset{(32)}{=} \sum_{k=0}^{r} \beta_k(r) \sum_{i=0}^{w} E_i(0) Q_k(i) \\
&\overset{(31)}{=} \beta_0(r) \binom{n}{w}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, using (28) we obtain

$$\beta_0(r) = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{w}} \sum_{i=0}^{w} \binom{w}{i} \binom{n-w}{i} Q_1(i)^r.$$

Let $0 \le r \le d' - 1$, then from (34) and (29) we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{w} \Big(1 - \frac{ni}{w(n-w)}\Big)^r b_i = \frac{|\mathcal{C}|}{\binom{n}{w}} \sum_{i=0}^{w} \binom{w}{i} \binom{n-w}{i} \Big(1 - \frac{ni}{w(n-w)}\Big)^r \tag{35}$$

Equality (13) follows upon rewriting the right-hand side of (35) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{w} \frac{\binom{w}{i}\binom{n-w}{i}}{\binom{n}{w}} \Big(1 - \frac{ni}{w(n-w)}\Big)^r &= \sum_{i=0}^{w} \frac{\binom{w}{i}\binom{n-w}{w-i}}{\binom{n}{w}} \Big(1 - \frac{n(w-i)}{w(n-w)}\Big)^r \\ &= \Big(\frac{n}{w(n-w)}\Big)^r \sum_{i=0}^{w} \frac{\binom{w}{i}\binom{n-w}{w-i}}{\binom{n}{w}} \Big(i - \frac{w^2}{n}\Big)^r. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 9.

REFERENCES

[1] E. Bannai and T. Ito, *Algebraic combinatorics I. Association schemes*, Benjamen/Cummings, London e. a., 1984.

[2] L.A. Bassalygo and V.V. Rykov, *Multiple-access hyperchannel*, Problems of Information Transmission **49** (2013), no. 4, 399–307.

[3] C. L. Chan, S. Jaggi, V. Saligrama, and S. Agnihorti, *Non-adaptive group testing: Explicit bonds and novel algorithms*, Proc. IEEE Internat. Sympos. Inform. Theory, 2012, pp. 1837–1841.

[4] C.H. Colbourn and J.H. Dinitz (eds.), *Handbook of combinatorial designs*, 2nd ed., Chapman & Hall, 2007.

[5] P. Delsarte, *An algebraic approach to the association schemes of coding theory*, Philips Research Repts Suppl. **10** (1973), 1–97.

[6] ———, *Four fundamental parameters of a code and their combinatorial significance*, Information and Control **23** (1973), 407–438.

[7] D. Z. Du and F.K. Hwang, *Combinatorial group testing and its applications*, 2nd ed., World Scientific, 2000.

[8] D.-Z. Du and F.K. Hwang, *Pooling designs and nonadaptive group testing*, World Scientific, 2006.

[9] A. G. D'yachkov and V. V. Rykov, *Bounds on the length of disjunctive codes*, Problemy Peredachi Informatsii **18** (1982), no. 3, 7–13.

[10] A. G. D'yachkov, I.V. Vorobyev, N. A. Polyanskii, and V. Yu. Shchukin, *Almost cover-free codes and designs*, ArXiv preprint arXiv:1410.8566 (2014).

[11] A.G. D'yachkov, A. J. Macula, and V.V. Rykov, *New applications and results of superimposed code theory arising from the potentialities of molecular biology*, Numbers, information and complexity (Bielefeld, 1998), Kluwer Acad. Publ., Boston, MA, 2000, pp. 265–282.

[12] A.G. D'yachkov, I.V. Vorob'ev, N.A. Polyansky, and V.Yu. Shchukin, *Bounds on the rate of disjunctive codes*, Problems of Information Transmission **50** (2014), 27–56.

[13] A. Emad and O. Milenkovic, *Semiquantitative group testing*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **60** (2014), no. 8, 4614–4636.

[14] Z. Füredi, *On r-cover-free families*, Journ. Combin. Theory, Ser. A **73** (1996), 172–173.

[15] A. C Gilbert, B. Hemenway, A. Rudra, M. J. Strauss, and M. Wootters, *Recovering simple signals*, Information Theory and Applications Workshop (ITA), 2012, IEEE, 2012, pp. 382–391.

[16] Y. Hansen and H. Stichtenoth, *Group codes on certain algebraic curves with many rational points*, Appl. Alg. Commun. Contr. Comput. **1** (1990), 67–77.

[17] W. Hoeffding, *Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables*, J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. **58** (1963), 13–30.

[18] F.K. Hwang and V. Sós, *Non-adaptive hypergeometric group testing*, Studia Sci. Math. Hungar **22** (1987), 257–263.

[19] W. B. Johnson, G. Schechtman, and J. Zinn, *Best constants in moment inequalities for linear combinations of independent and exchangeable random variables*, Ann. Probab. **13** (1985), 234–253.

[20] W Kautz and R. Singleton, *Nonrandom binary superimposed codes*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **10** (1964), no. 4, 363–377.

[21] P. Keevash, *The existence of designs*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.3665 (2014).

[22] G. Kuperberg, S. Lovett, and R. Peled, *Probabilistic existence of regular combinatorial structures*, arXiv:1302.4295 (2013).

[23] A. J. Macula, V. V. Rykov, and S. Yekhanin, *Trivial two-stage group testing for complexes using almost disjunct matrices*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **137** (2004), no. 1, 97–107.

[24] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, *The theory of error-correcting codes*, North-Holland, 1977.

[25] M. B. Malyutov, *Mathematical models and results in the theory of screening experiments*, Problems of Cybernetics, no. 35, USSR Academy of Sciences, Moscow, 1977, in Russian, pp. 5–69.

[26] ———, *The separating property of random matrices*, Mathematical Notes **23** (1978), no. 1, 84–91.

[27] A. Mazumdar, *Nonadaptive group testing with random set of defectives via constant-weight codes*, arXiv:1503:03596.

[28] ———, *On almost disjunct matrices for group testing*, Algorithms and Computation, Springer, 2012, pp. 649–658.

[29] Q. A. Nguen and T. Zeisei, *Bounds on constant weight binary superimposed codes*, Probl. Contr. Inform. Theory **17** (1988), 223–230.

[30] G. Peshkir and A. N. Shiryaev, *The Khintchine inequalities and martingale expanding sphere of their action*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **50** (1995), no. 5(305), 3–62, translation in Russian Math. Surveys 50 (1995), no. 5, 849–904.

[31] V. Pless, *Power moment identities on weight distributions in error correcting codes*, Information and Control **6** (1963), no. 2, 147–152.

[32] E. Porat and A. Rothschild, *Explicit non-adaptive combinatorial group testing schemes*, Automata, languages and programming. Part I, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 5125, Springer, Berlin, 2008, pp. 748–759.

[33] Y.-F. Ren and H.-Y. Liang, *On the best constant in Marcinkiewicz–Zygmund inequality*, Statistics & Probability Letters **53** (2001), no. 3, 227–233.

[34] H.P. Rosenthal, *On the subspaces pf $l^p (p > 2)$ spanned by sequences of independent random variables*, Israel J. Math. **8** (1970), no. 3, 273–303.

[35] M. Ruszinkó, *On the upper bound on the size of the r-cover-free families*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A **66** (1994), 302–310.

[36] V. M. Sidelnikov, *Upper bounds on the cardinality of a binary code with a given minimum distance*, Information and Control **28** (1975), no. 4, 292–303, Translated from the Russian by A. M. Odlyzko (Problemy Peredači Informacii **10** (1974), no. 2, 43–51).

[37] V. M. Sidelnikov and O. Yu. Prikhodov, *On the construction of (w, r) cover-free codes*, Probl. Inform. Trans. **45** (2009), no. 1, 36–40.

[38] D. R. Stinson, *Combinatorial designs: constructions and analysis*, Springer, New York, 2004.

[39] H. Tarnanen, *An approach to constant-weight and Lee codes by using the methods of association schemes*, Annals Univ. Turkuensis, Ser. A, vol. 182, Turku, 1982.

[40] A. Zhigljavsky, *Probabilistic existence theorems in group testing*, Journal of statistical planning and inference **115** (2003), no. 1, 1–43.